UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,055	09/26/2003	Bharat T. Doshi	Doshi 58-10-27-19-36	1226

46850 7590 04/18/2007

MENDELSOHN & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
1500 JOHN F. KENNEDY BLVD., SUITE 405
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19102

EXAMINER	
HO, CHUONG T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2616	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/673,055	DOSHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHUONG T. HO	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 September 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11,13 and 15-17* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *12 and 14* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1,2,3*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the Application SN 10/673,055 filed on 09/26/03. .Claim 1-17 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 07/31/06; 11/21/05; 09/26/03 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On the page 1, under section "Cross-Reference to Related Applications", the cited copending applications should be updated with current statuses such as U.S. Patent Application Serial No., the filing date, U.S. Patent No., and the issued date.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3-9, 13, 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishibashi et al. (U.S.2003/0147352 A1) in view of Buddhikot et al. (U.S.Patent No. 2004/0004938).

As to claim 1, Ishibashi et al. discloses a system for determining a restoration path corresponding to a primary path (301, 302) for a new service in a mesh network (page 1, [0004], multi-protocol label switching technology in a mesh network) having a plurality of nodes (figure 16, ABCDEF) interconnected by a plurality of links (figure 16, G1...G7), the system comprising:

For each of plurality of candidate restoration paths (figure 16, 311 for 301, 312 for 302) associated with the primary path;

Determining whether the primary path requires any additional restoration bandwidth ([0144], the 1:1 or shared-type protection paths can be distinguished from each other for separate management by the different amounts of reserved bandwidth as given by the following relations ([0145] [0146], shared protection bandwidth, bandwidth reserved for protection path) required any additional restoration bandwidth to be reserved on any link of the candidate restoration path based on whether, for each link of the candidate restoration path, the primary path (figure 16, 301) is SRLG-disjoint from each other primary path (302) that is currently protected by that link ([0148], the working and protection TDM paths 301, 311 have a bandwidth of STS-1 and the working and protection TDM paths 302, 312 have bandwidth of STS-3. The extra traffic path 303 has a bandwidth of STS-1 which occupies a portion of the STS-3 bandwidth the shared-type protection path 312);

A shared risk link group (SRLG) (page 6, [0079], SRLG (shared risk link group) of a working path that forms a pair with the requested protection path) is set of two or more links, for which a failure of any one link in the SRLG is associated with a relatively high risk of failure of the other links in the SRLG ([0006], In a GMPLS network, a list of SRLG identifiers is maintained for each link of the network that belongs to the SRL groups of the list. Two paths are the to be SRLG-disjoint if their links belong to different sets of shared risk link groups in each of which any one of the links do not overlap any one of the other group. If one of the SRL groups fails, the SRLG-disjoint paths never fail simultaneously);
Two paths are SRLG-disjoint if no two links in the two paths are member of any one SRLG ([0008], when a path setup request is generated, the network calculates a pair of SRLG-disjoint working and protection paths. A signaling message is then transmitted through the network. In this process, bandwidth reservation is performed for both working and protection paths, figure 16).

However, Ishibashi et al. is silent to disclosing generating a path cost for the candidate restoration path, wherein the path cost is a function of whether any such additional restoration bandwidth is required.

Buddhikot et al. discloses generating a path cost for the candidate restoration path, wherein the path cost is a function of whether any such additional restoration bandwidth is required ([0008], the at least one restoration path may then be computed based upon the at least one restoration path cost. Post processing may then be performed b free access bandwidth reserved on each restoration path and minimize bandwidth usage on each restoration path) (a

method of providing guaranteed bandwidth routing paths with local restoration utilizing minimum bandwidth usage is desirable to reduce cost of routing information at economy of scale) (abstract, the at least one restoration path may then be computed based upon the at least one restoration path costs);

Selecting the restoration path for the new service based on the path cost for each candidate restoration path ([0019], post processing is utilized to reduce extra bandwidth reservation for backup paths) ([0126], Once the required bandwidth is determined of a particular backup link, at step 1612, the necessary bandwidth is reserved in the backup links to satisfy restoration for a particular request).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate generating a path cost for the candidate restoration path, wherein the path cost is a function of whether any such additional restoration bandwidth is required taught by Buddhikot into the system of Ishibashi. One would have motivated to do so to utilize minimum bandwidth usage is desirable to reduce cost of routing information at economy of scale.

6. As to claim 15, Ishibashi et al. discloses a system for determining a restoration path corresponding to a primary path (301, 302) for a new service in a mesh network (page 1, [0004], multi-protocol label switching technology in a mesh network) having a plurality of nodes (figure 16, ABCDEF) interconnected by a plurality of links (figure 16, G1...G7), the system comprising:

For each of plurality of candidate restoration paths (figure 16, 311 for 301, 312 for 302) associated with the primary path;

Determining whether the primary path requires any additional restoration bandwidth ([0144], the 1:1 or shared-type protection paths can be distinguished from each other for separate management by the different amounts of reserved bandwidth as given by the following relations ([0145] [0146], shared protection bandwidth, bandwidth reserved for protection path) required any additional restoration bandwidth to be reserved on any link of the candidate restoration path based on whether, for each link of the candidate restoration path, the primary path (figure 16, 301) is SRLG-disjoint from each other primary path (302) that is currently protected by that link ([0148], the working and protection TDM paths 301, 311 have a bandwidth of STS-1 and the working and protection TDM paths 302, 312 have bandwidth of STS-3. The extra traffic path 303 has a bandwidth of STS-1 which occupies a portion of the STS-3 bandwidth the shared-type protection path 312);

A shared risk link group (SRLG) (page 6, [0079], SRLG (shared risk link group) of a working path that forms a pair with the requested protection path) is set of two or more links, for which a failure of any one link in the SRLG is associated with a relatively high risk of failure of the other links in the SRLG ([0006], In a GMPLS network, a list of SRLG identifiers is maintained for each link of the network that belongs to the SRL groups of the list. Two paths are the to be SRLG-disjoint if their links belong to different sets of shared risk link groups in each of which any one of the links do not overlap any one of the other group. If one of the SRL groups fails, the SRLG-disjoint paths never fail simultaneously);

Two paths are SRLG-disjoint if no two links in the two paths are member of any one SRLG ([0008], when a path setup request is generated, the network calculates a pair of SRLG-disjoint working and protection paths. A signaling message is then transmitted through the network. In this process, bandwidth reservation is performed for both working and protection paths, figure 16).

However, Ishibashi et al. is silent to disclosing generating a path cost for the candidate restoration path, wherein the path cost is a function of whether any such additional restoration bandwidth is required.

Buddhikot et al. discloses the network manager is adapted to generate a path cost for the candidate restoration path, wherein the path cost is a function of whether any such additional restoration bandwidth is required ([0008], the at least one restoration path may then be computed based upon the at least one restoration path cost. Post processing may then be performed b free access bandwidth reserved on each restoration path and minimize bandwidth usage on each restoration path) (a method of providing guaranteed bandwidth routing paths with local restoration utilizing minimum bandwidth usage is desirable to reduce cost of routing information at economy of scale) (abstract, the at least one restoration path may then be computed based upon the at least one restoration path costs);

The network manager is further adapted to select the restoration path for the new service based on the path cost for each candidate restoration path ([0019], post processing is utilized to reduce extra bandwidth reservation for backup paths) ([0126], Once the required bandwidth is determined of a particular backup link, at

step 1612, the necessary bandwidth is reserved in the backup links to satisfy restoration for a particular request).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate generating a path cost for the candidate restoration path, wherein the path cost is a function of whether any such additional restoration bandwidth is required taught by Buddhikot into the system of Ishibashi. One would have motivated to do so to utilize minimum bandwidth usage is desirable to reduce cost of routing information at economy of scale.

7. As to claim 3, Ishibashi discloses each candidate restoration path is SRLG-disjoint from the primary path)[0009], To seek a shortest path in GMPLS, use is made of a route calculation algorithm known as CSPF (Constrained Shortest Path First) which applies the Dijkstra algorithm to a set of links that satisfy a set of constraints, such as SRLG disjoint between working and protection paths).

8. As to claim 4, Ishibashi discloses determining whether the link is part of an SRLG; and if the link is part of SRLG, then excluding nay path having a link in that SRLG from consideration as a candidate restoration path ([006], list of SRLG identifiers is maintained for each link of the network that belongs to the SRL groups of the list. Two paths are the to be SRLG-disjoint if their links belong to different sets of shared risk link groups in each of which any one of the links do not overlap any one of the other group).

9. As to the claim 5, Buddhikot discloses assigning a link cost to each link of each candidate restoration path; reducing the link cost by a factor R for each link

of each candidate restoration path for which sharing is possible; generating a path cost for each candidate restoration path based on a sum of the link costs for the links of that candidate restoration path; and selecting one of the candidate restoration paths for the primary path based on minimum path cost (see abstract, [0009]).

10. As to the claim 6, Buddhikot discloses the factor R is a function of sharing degree for each link ([0054], the amount of bandwidth reserved by all restoration (i.e. backup) paths, the residual capacity R).

11. As to claim 7, Buddhikot discloses determining whether utilization of the link is greater than a specified threshold; if the link utilization is greater than the specified threshold, then generating the link cost as a function of an administrative weight for the link and available capacity on the link; and if the link utilization is less than the specified threshold, then generating the link cost as a function of the administrative weight for the link ([0054] [0074][0083] [0091] [0095] [0122]).

12. As to the claim 8, Buddhikot discloses wherein the link cost is also generated as a function of an administrative weight for the link ([0054] [0074][0083] [0091] [0095] [0122]).

13. As to the claim 9, Buddhikot discloses wherein the link cost is also generated as a function of a form of a sharing degree ([0054] [0074][0083] [0091] [0095] [0122]).

14. As to claim 13, Buddhikot et al. discloses the system is implemented for each of a plurality of candidate primary paths to generate a path cost associated

with the candidate primary path and further comprising selecting one of the candidate primary paths for the new service ([0054] [0074][0083] [0091] [0095] [0122]).

15. As to claim 16, Buddhikot discloses where the network manager is distributed over the network (figure 15A, [0054] [0074][0083] [0091] [0095] [0122]).

16. As to claim 17, Buddhikot discloses where the network manager is located at a single node of the network (figure 15A, [0054] [0074][0083] [0091] [0095] [0122]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined system (Ishibashi – Buddhikot) in view of Le Roux et al. (20070011284).

As to claim 2, the combined system (Ishibashi – Buddhikot) discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

However, the combined system (Ishibashi – Buddhikot) are silent to disclosing wherein a failure of any one link in an SRLG is associated with a risk of failure of the other links in the SRLG greater than a specified risk threshold .

Le Roux et al. discloses wherein a failure of any one link in an SRLG is associated with a risk of failure of the other links in the SRLG greater than a specified risk threshold ([0073], For this purpose, a Failure Risk or FR is defined as a link, a node or an SRLG. Naturally, for an SRLG, the actual risk of failure concerns the underlying physical resource but, for reasons of simplification, the SRLG will be associated with the physical resource in question.).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate wherein a failure of any one link in an SRLG is associated with a risk of failure of the other links in the SRLG greater than a specified risk threshold taught by Le Roux into the combined system (Ishibashi – Buddhikot. One would have been motivated to do so to allow network resource are reserved on each of the links of the bypass tunnel in order to back up the said path in the event failure of the said element.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined system (Ishibashi – Buddhikot) in view of Swallow (U.S.Patent No. 7,099,286 B1)

As to claim 10, the combined system (Ishibashi – Buddhikot) discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

However, the combined system (Ishibashi – Buddhikot) are silent to disclosing wherein the form of the sharing degree is an approximation to the sharing degree that is calculated using a binary representation of a node link vector and a binary representation of a primary path node link vector, wherein the calculation of the approximation comprises: computing the bitwise AND of the binary representation of the node-link vector and the binary representation of the primary path node link vector.

Swallow discloses wherein the form of the sharing degree is an approximation to the sharing degree that is calculated using a binary representation of a node link vector and a binary representation of a primary path node link vector, wherein the calculation of the approximation comprises: computing the bitwise AND of the binary representation of the node-link vector and the binary representation of the primary path node link vector (Communication in a computer network involves the exchange of data between two or more entities interconnected by communication links and subnetworks. Entities concerned primarily with the correct routing of information in the network are called routers, to distinguish them from end systems which process traffic but do not take part in routing it. There are two fundamentally different approaches to

the distribution and use of routing information in a network, called Distance Vector Routing and Link) (Implicitly in the provisioning operation is the notion of a Shared Risk Link Group (SRLG). SRLG is a relatively new concept that has been introduced to provide inputs necessary to plan for reliability in transport networks (see, for example, S. Chaudhuri et al., "Control of Lightpaths in an Optical Network", IETF Internet Draft, February 2000). A SRLG is a group of links that shat share a component whose failure causes the failure of all links of the group. The SRLG is associated with an entity at risk, typically a fiber span, and is a union of all links that ride on the fiber span. Links may traverse multiple fiber spans, and thus be in multiple SRLGs. In order to identify SRLGs, links are tagged with a token which indicates a particular facility which is at risk of failure. For example, a particular conduit may have a token `45` and any circuit that passes through that conduit would carry the token `45` (among a possible long list of other tokens). All of the links that carry this token are part of a SRLG. When looking for backup routes, a route which is independent of any SRLG that is associated with the primary path is sought).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate wherein the form of the sharing degree is an approximation to the sharing degree that is calculated using a binary representation of a node link vector and a binary representation of a primary path node link vector, wherein the calculation of the approximation comprises: computing the bitwise AND of the binary representation of the node-link vector and the binary representation of the primary path node link vector taught by

Swallow into the combined system (Ishibashi – Buddhikot). One would have been motivated to do so to find shared risk diverse paths.

21. As to claim 11, Buddhikot to disdclose wherein the sharability of a link in a candidate restoration path is represented by a sharing degree for the link, wherein the sharing degree is a maximum number of additional unit bandwidth primary services that can be added to the candidate primary without increasing restoration bandwidth reserved on the link (see [0053] [0108], additional bandwidth).

Allowable Subject Matter

22. Claims 12, 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Lin et al. (2002/0194339) ; Lakshminarayana et a. (2003/0018812) ; Lin et al. (2003/0065811) ; Antosik et al. (2002/0191244).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHUONG T. HO whose telephone number is (571) 272-3133. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3155. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

04/14/07

HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600